

Date: Sat, 24 Apr 93 04:30:21 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #114  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sat, 24 Apr 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 114

Today's Topics:

10meters (Give it to CB)  
CW = effective utilization?  
OO != Slow

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Fri, 23 Apr 1993 09:22:30 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!cs.utexas.edu!sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!  
hpwin052!hpmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: 10meters (Give it to CB)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

There is one easy answer to Zack's question

" What can an average amateur build?"

HIS KNOWLEDGE !

Do enough of that and they can build anything that can be built.

Some friends, with no college level technical education, have been

building transceivers for many years, but always shied away from phase locked loops. A year ago, they wanted to find out about the things. I got the job of explaining. To understand the tradeoffs involved and the importance of the various characteristics, we had to start off with phase noise, discrete sidebands and reciprocal mixing; settling time was easy. Natural frequency and damping factor of any feedback system are easy enough concepts to grasp, but the maths for calculating them was not obvious enough for easy acceptance. We wound up going the long way round poles & zeroes and root locus. This geometrical rather than algebraic/calculus approach proved very digestible, I wound up being diverted into showing how a few simple pole-zero patterns were the basic sources of all our usual filter designs. The end result is that these folk can make PLLs behave in ways they can predict, and they are also now busily spreading their new knowledge.

At the beginning, I thought they were leaping into things they would not be able to manage. Because they were friends, I did not say this, and set out to try. They were right, I was wrong, perhaps I had the more educational experience ! It was hard work trying to find a route where all the stages could be visualised and related to observable effects, but the result was very satisfying.

There are certain areas of knowledge that people think are beyond them, areas where people believe that other folk are incapable of understanding. Consequently publishers are unlikely to include, say, control theory in RadCom 73, or QST. This means that people are protected from any exposure, and any risk of learning.

"No one will understand that" is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Do not underestimate people's ability to learn. (that was my mistake)

Cheers

David      GM4ZNX

-----  
Date: 22 Apr 93 21:12:09 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!pasteur!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!swrinde!emory!ogicse!psgrain!percy!ornews.intel.com!chnews!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: CW = effective utilization?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Kevin Purcell writes:

>|> How about we do the amateur exams in Latin.

Bill Gunshannon responds:

>Now there's the first practical suggestion I've seen come out of this whole  
>debate. I'm all for it!!!

And I say:

Illegitimi non Carborundum!

-----  
Date: Wed, 21 Apr 93 21:15:11 GMT

From: pacbell.com!iggy.GW.Vitalink.COM!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!psinntp!  
psinntp!laidbak!tella5!balr!ttd.teradyne.com!news@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: 00 != Slow

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr19.174801.27371@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) writes:

> If movement to the CW portions of the band is the solution, what makes you  
> think requiring it as a licensing requirement will motivate amateurs to  
> move off of the SSB segments any more than CW's "spectral efficiency",  
> lower utilization of its segments, and its ability to cut through the QRM  
> will get them to move? What a crock. Let's bring back smoke signals,  
> there's lots of under utilized air in the country. ;-)  
>

A very interesting statistic, is the fact that a very high percentage of  
code-free techs upgrade to tech plus, within a year of first becoming licensed.  
The percentage is greater than 60%. They must be finding 'SOME' added value  
in upgrading.

-----  
John Rice - K9IJ | "Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was  
rice@ttd.teradyne.com | MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially  
(708)-940-9000 - (work) | Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959  
(708)-438-5065 - (bbs ) | Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV  
-----

Date: 23 Apr 1993 07:31:50 GMT  
From: pipex!uknet!mcsun!fuug!funic!helle.fmi.fi!sumppu!oh3njz@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1396@arrl.org>, <1993Apr21.010809.3529@physics.unr.edu>,  
<930421.184315.0H6.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>mcsun  
Subject : Re: 10meters (Give it to CB)

system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>mswmod@nimbus.sage.unr.edu (stark) writes:

>> Let me ask you this Zack, how many hams do you know who have never  
>> owned a soldering iron? How many that don't even own a little multi  
>> meter?  
>>  
>> When I became active again a few years ago things had changed a lot.  
>> Most newer hams just wanted to operate. No disire to figure out what  
>> makes things tick. Maybe it's just a sign of the times.....

You are absolutely right! And I'm a little worried about that. One of the reasons might be, that the excaminations are nowadays completely different than in the good times ;-)) Just write a "+" or "-". Seems too easy to me. Some people do think, that the amount of hams is only driver. The quality doesn't mean anything. In the past to be a ham was something, you all know what it is now. Perhaps I'm too "one-eyed", but still ...

One example; When you got licenced, in the past you were very exciting to get on the air. Nowadays more and more of just licenced hams became QRT as they get their licence (not QRV even a second). And please note, that I wouldn't talk about technical knowledge. That's completely other story.

It is seen, that the techical knowledge needs more and more everyday. Just knowing the basics is not enough, because all the buy'n'work equipment have become so complicated. And if you are not a professional, it's almost impossible to handle (if you can make it, you ARE a professional). This might impact to the "wanna\_know\_how\_it\_works" attitude.

-Sepi, oh3njz@oh3rba.fin.eu // Seppo.Pekonen@fmi.fi

OH3NJZ@OH3RBA.FIN.EU  
Finnish Meteorological Institute (Ilmatieteen laitos)

-----  
Date: Wed, 21 Apr 1993 15:57:18 GMT  
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!  
spool.mu.edu!mixcom.com!mei.mon@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <930418.133623.7K4.rusnews.w165w@mooch.sbs.com>,  
<1993Apr20.163759.19443@mixcom.mixcom.com>,  
<1993Apr20.175953.10622@VFL.Paramax.COM>  
Subject : Re: Just waiting the OFs out

In <1993Apr20.175953.10622@VFL.Paramax.COM> rossi@VFL.Paramax.COM (Pete Rossi)  
writes:

>Hey, most of the new hams I have met, NO CODEs, or whatever, didn't even  
>know how to install a PL-259 on the end of their coax... at first. But  
>they learn just like everyone else.

I agree. What I was arguing for is more theory in exchange for dropping  
the code requirement. Something like "installing a PL-259" is something  
you obviously learn by doing. Same thing with constructing a dipole (which  
appeared to be of great concern to the previous poster).

Knowing HOW to do something and knowing WHY it is done that way (and what  
action to take if it DOES NOT WORK) are two entirely different things.  
In that light, a more intense written exam (no multiple choice) covering  
greater theory (and it's application to real-world communications) would  
appear more valuable than spending that time learning code. Code should  
be an option, just as spread-spectrum and microwave is an option. The  
mode of communication is not near as important as the theory behind it  
all. IMHO.

And regarding "appliance" builders: there are numerous microwave and  
other VHF/UHF projects available. And I have my own spread-spectrum  
project in the works. I do not really care if the first purchase of  
a new-ham is an off-the-shelf rig. In time, most of them do a little  
kit-building and experimentation. They even build dipoles, as complex  
as they are! ;-)

-----  
Kevin Jessup, N9SQB

Temporarily using our companies corporate account. Many other  
individuals use it as well. Please state in any E-mail follow-ups

that the mail is intended for me so as to avoid confusion. Thanks.

Marquette Electronics, Inc. account information follows...

-----

--

mei.mon@mixcom.com

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #114

\*\*\*\*\*